

REMARKS

This application pertains to a novel thermoplastic hot-melt adhesive which is useful for bonding electrical modules to card bodies and is activated at implanting temperatures of 150°C.

Claims 1-8 are pending.

The Examiner has reminded Applicants that trademarks should be capitalized wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Applicants have now amended the paragraphs of the specification where trademarks appear, to capitalize the trademarks. It is noted, however, that the original description already included generic descriptions of the trademarked compositions. Thus, at page 5, lines 3- 10, epoxy resins are disclosed and specific examples of the epoxy resins, including their trademarks, are given in the paragraph beginning at line 12. Therefore, the generic descriptions of the trademarked compositions are already present.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Feichtmeier et al (U.S. 6,350,791) and further in view of Kelch et al. (U.S. 2002/0068182).

The Feichtmeier reference discloses some heat-sealing adhesives. However, the amounts given in the Feichtmeier reference never add up to 100 % .

Kelch, on the other hand, discloses that polyester could be part of multilayer films and that the adhesive could be based on polyesters like GRILTEX 9. However, it is not taught or suggested that adhesives based on GRILTEX 9 have heat-sealing properties or could be heat-activated in any way. By contrast, those skilled in the art would recognize that the Kelch multilayer films comprising a PE layer and two adhesives would not be expected to be heat-activable: Prior to the adhesive layers becoming adhesive, the PE core of the tape would be expected to melt away. Therefore, the Kelch tapes are not applicable as heat-activable adhesive films.

Therefore, there is no reason why any person skilled in the art would add GRILTEX 9 to the Feichtmeier adhesives, as the Examiner proposes, and there is no reason why those skilled in the art would "modify" the adhesive compositions of Feichtmeier et al with GRILTEX[®] 9, as the Examiner suggests. No combination of Feichtmeier and Kelch could therefore ever lead to Applicants novel adhesive sheets, and the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Feichtmeier et al (U.S. 6,350,791) and further in view of Kelch et al. (U.S. 2002/0068182) should therefore now be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Feichtmeier et al (U.S. 6,350,791) in view of Kelch et al (U.S. 2002/0068182) and further in view of Vieilledent (U.S. 4,701,236).

The reasons why those skilled in the art would never modify the Feichtmeier et al compositions by the addition of Kelch's GRILTEX[®] 9 are discussed above. The Examiner turns to Vieilledent for a teaching of thickness of adhesive. No thickness of adhesive could ever overcome the reasons why Kelch and Feichtmeier would never be combined, as discussed above.

The rejection of claims 2 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Feichtmeier et al (U.S. 6,350,791) in view of Kelch et al (U.S. 2002/0068182) and further in view of Vieilledent (U.S. 4,701,236) should therefore now be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Feichtmeier et al (U.S. 6,350,791) in view of Kelch et al (U.S. 2002/0068182) and further in view of Haghiri-Tehrani (U.S. 4,897,534). The reasons why those skilled in the art would never modify the Feichtmeier et al compositions by the addition of Kelch's GRILTEX[®] 9 are discussed above. The Examiner turns to the Haghiri-Tehrani reference for a method of using an adhesive to secure a chip to a card. Nothing in the Haghiri-Tehrani would provide any reason to add Kelch's GRILTEX[®] 9 to the Feichtmeier et al compositions. Therefore, no combination of Feichtmeier et al, Kelch et al and Haghiri-Tehrani could ever lead to Applicants' novel adhesive sheets.

The rejection of claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Feichtmeier et al (U.S. 6,350,791) in view of Kelch et al (U.S. 2002/0068182) and further in view of Haghiri-Tehrani (U.S. 4,897,534) should therefore now be withdrawn.

In view of the present amendments and remarks it is believed that claims 1-8 are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of said claims by the Examiner is respectfully requested and the allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If any extension of time for this response is required, Applicant requests that this be considered a petition therefor. Please charge the required petition fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fee or credit any excess to Deposit Account

No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,
NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS

By /William C. Gerstenzang/
William C. Gerstenzang
Reg. No. 27,552

WCG/tmo

875 Third Avenue- 18th Floor
New York, New York 10022
(212) 808-0700